

REMARKS

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 15-18, 20, 22-24, 27-30 and 32 as being anticipated by Cass (US Patent 5,692,073).

2. In response, the Applicant has sought to amend independent claims 1 and 16 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the invention disclosed in Cass. The Applicant submits that the claimed invention differs from Cass for at least the following reasons:

The Cass system detects the presence of written marks on a document by scanning or faxing a marked document into the system and comparing it with an unmarked document stored in the system. The differences in the pixels of the two documents indicate the markings made by a user.

The closest equivalent of the claimed "*sensing device*" in the Cass system is a scanner/fax receiving device in combination with a document comparison processor in a computer.

The "*sensing device*" of claim 16 of the present invention is adapted to transmit request data to the computer system. The request data is defined as "*being indicative of the identity of the document and of one or both of:*

- (i) *a position of the sensing device relative to the document; and*
- (ii) *an identity of the at least one user interactive element."*

Since the "*sensing device*" of Cass comprises either a scanner or a fax receiving program, such a sensing device does not move in relation to the page it is scanning and is therefore not capable of detecting its position "*relative to the document.*"

In addition, the Examiner has suggested in paragraph 7 of the Detailed Action that "*Cass teaches that the document includes coded data indicative of an identity of the document and of the at least one interactive element.*" Although Cass does teach that the document includes coded data indicative of an identity of the document, the Applicant submits that the document in the Cass system does not include "*coded data indicative of an identity of ...the at least one interactive element.*" The Examiner relies on col. 11, lines 22-33 to support his

argument. The most relevant sentence is at lines 23-26: *“if the document happens to be already coded with a machine-readable symbolic code, such as a data glyph or bar code, this machine-readable code can be used as the index of the document.”*

It is clear from this sentence that the *“data glyph or bar code”* identifies the further document which the user would like to obtain, not the identity of the *“active element”* or the *“user interactive element”* itself. Using the wording of the claimed invention, the Cass *“data glyph or bar code”* is equivalent to *“coded data indicative of an identity of”* a further document. It is not *“indicative of an identity of ...the at least one interactive element”*. In the Cass system, the *“active elements”* do not have any identity information associated with them and the Cass sensing device is not adapted to sense such interactive element identity information.

Similar arguments apply to amended independent claim 1 and new independent claims 34, 41, 47 and 54.

For these reasons the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 16, 34, 41, 47 and 54 are novel in light of Cass and asks the Examiner to reconsider his objections.

3. The Examiner has suggested in paragraph 7 of the Detailed Action that claim 9 (now incorporated into amended claim 1) and claims 10-14, 25, 26 and 31 are obvious in light of Cass in view of Dymetman (US Patent 6,330,976). He suggests that it would have been obvious *“to combine the sensing device of Dymetman with the method of Cass.”*

4. In response, the Applicant has sought to amend independent claims 1 and 16 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the invention disclosed in Dymetman. The Applicant submits that the invention claimed in claim 1 differs from Cass in view of Dymetman because neither of those citations disclose a system or method in which the *“list of directory entries and the coded data [are] printed substantially simultaneously.”*

The Applicant submits that none of the citations disclose simultaneous printing of the directory entries and the coded data. By printing the directory entries and coded data

simultaneously, registration of the two groups of information, both physically and logically is made easier.

Dymetman explicitly teaches away from simultaneously printing and teaches separate printing of coded sheets which are then supplied to a publisher (see col. 11, lines 46 to 65).

Similarly, Cass does not disclose simultaneous printing but instead states: *“if the document happens to be already coded with a machine-readable symbolic code, such as a data glyph or bar code, this machine-readable code can be used as the index of the document”* (Emphasis added. See col. 11, lines 23-26).

In paragraph 7 of the Detailed Action, when dealing with original claim 12, the Examiner refers to col. 11, lines 22-26 in support of his view that Cass discloses such simultaneous printing. With respect, those sentences refer, as does Dymetman, to a *“publisher”*, suggesting that the coded pages are provided to the end user with coded data pre-printed thereon by the publisher.

The Applicant submits that neither the Dymetman nor the Cass citations disclose a system or method in which the *“list of directory entries and the coded data [are] printed substantially simultaneously.”*

The comments made regarding simultaneous printing in relation to claim 1 apply equally to claims 16, 34, 41, 47 and 54.

For these reasons the Applicant submits that amended claims 1, 16, 34, 41, 47 and 54 are novel and inventive in light of Cass and Dymetman and asks that the Examiner reconsider his obviousness objection.

6. Since amended claims 1, 16, 34, 41, 47 and 54 are novel and inventive, the Applicant further submits that their corresponding subsidiary claims are also novel and inventive in light of the cited prior art.

7. The Examiner has suggested that claim 33 is obvious in light of Cass in view of Kobayashi et al (US Patent 5,881,352). In light of the amendments made to independent claim 16, the Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider this objection.

8. A number of other minor changes have been made to the claims and specification in order to improve their clarity. The Applicant submits that these minor amendments do not introduce any new matter.

### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia@silverbrook.com.au](mailto:kia@silverbrook.com.au)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9818 6711

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the claims

Claims 1, 10, 12-14, 16, 18, 21-22, 25, 26, 31 and 32 have been amended as follows:

1. (Amended) A method of enabling navigation of a directory, including:

(a) printing a document containing including:

(i) a list of directory entries corresponding to at least one node of an index of the directory, with;

(ii) at least one user interactive element which enables a user to indicate a request for further directory information by interacting with the at least one user interactive element using a sensing device which is adapted to transmit request data to a computer system; and

(iii) coded data indicative of an identity of the document and of one or both of:

(A) a position of the at least one user interactive element; and

(B) an identity of the at least one user interactive element,

the list of directory entries and the coded data being printed substantially simultaneously;

(b) receiving, in the computer system, request data from the sensing device, the request data being indicative of the identity of the document and of one or both of:

(i) a position of the sensing device relative to the document; and

(ii) an identity of the at least one user interactive element,

in order to identify the document and determine when the sensing device is used to interact with the at least one user interactive element; and

(c) printing the further directory information on a document.

10. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 9 1, including receiving, in the computer system, movement data regarding movement of the sensing device relative to the document.
12. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 9 1, wherein the document is printed on a surface of a surface defining structure ~~at the same time as the coded data is printed on the surface.~~
13. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 91, which includes printing the coded data to be substantially invisible in the visible spectrum.
14. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 91, including retaining a retrievable record of the printed document, the document being retrievable using the identity data as contained in the coded data.
16. (Amended) A system for enabling navigation of a directory, including:  
 a computer system for formatting a document, the document with including:  
 (i) a list of directory entries corresponding to at least one node of an index of the directory;  
 (ii) and at least one user interactive element to enable a user to request further directory information; and  
 (iii) coded data indicative of an identity of the document and of one or both of:  
(A) a position of the at least one user interactive element; and  
(B) an identity of the at least one user interactive element;  
 a printer for printing the document, the list of directory entries and the coded data being printed substantially simultaneously; and  
 a sensing device for interacting with the at least one user interactive element and

transmitting request data to the computer system to facilitate the further directory information being sent from the computer system to the printer for printing in a further document, the request data being indicative of the identity of the document and of one or both of:

- (i) a position of the sensing device relative to the document; and
- (ii) an identity of the at least one user interactive element.

18. (Amended) A system as claimed in claim 17, wherein the at least one user interactive element is associated with an operation of moving to one of a first, previous, next or last node in the index.

21. (Amended) A system as defined in claim 20, wherein the at least one user interactive element is associated with an operation of moving to one of a parent, child or root node of the index.

22. (Amended) A system as claimed in claim 16, wherein the at least one user interactive element is associated with a search function to facilitate searching of the directory.

25. (Amended) A system as claimed in claim ~~24~~16, wherein the computer system is adapted to receive movement data regarding movement of the sensing device relative to the document and interpret said movement of the sensing device as it relates to said at least one user interactive element, the sensing device, when moved relative to the document, sensing the data regarding said at least one user interactive element using at least some of the coded data and generating the data regarding its own movement relative to the document.

26. (Amended) A system as claimed in claim 25, wherein the sensing device senses its own movement relative to the document using the coded data.

31. (Amended) A system as claimed in claim ~~28~~16, wherein the coded data is substantially invisible in the visible spectrum.

32. (Amended) The system as claimed in claim ~~28~~16, including a database for keeping a retrievable record of each document generated, each document being retrievable by using its identity, as included in its coded data.

Claims 9, 24 and 30 have been cancelled.

Claims 34 to 60 have been added.